

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 **CHRISTOPHER KOHLS, et al.,**

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.
14

15 **ROB BONTA, in His Official Capacity as**
16 **Attorney General of the State of California,**
17 **and SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in Her Official**
18 **Capacity as California Secretary of State,**

19 Defendants.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 2:24-cv-02527-JAM-CKD

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

[PROPOSED] ORDER

After reviewing the parties' pleadings and accompanying documentation, the Court holds that there are no material facts in dispute and defendants are entitled to judgment on all claims as a matter of law. Both Assembly Bill 2839 and Assembly Bill 2655 are valid under the First Amendment as statutes narrowly tailored to further the State's compelling interest in ensuring free and fair elections. Nor is either statute unconstitutionally vague. Finally, Assembly Bill 2655 does not impose publisher liability on regulated platforms and is therefore not preempted by section 230(c) of the Communications Decency Act. The Court hereby **GRANTS** Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

The Honorable John A. Mendez
United States District Judge